

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action issued October 3, 2005, claims 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over an article "Remote Procedure Call" by Dave Marshall (Marshall) in view of admitted prior art (APA). Claims 3 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall in view of admitted prior art APA and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,088,694 to Burns et al. (Burns)

Claims 1-9 are now pending in this application. Claim 5 has been amended to clarify the subject matter that the applicant considers to be the invention.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 1, 2, 4-5, and 7-9 is not unpatentable over Marshall and any APA. In particular, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires determining the presence of the second data handling application and, if it is present, b) generating a link to a software routine provided by, and utilizing when executed, the first data handling application, which will be executed by the call routine in the second data handling application. Marshall does not disclose or suggest determining the presence of the second application and generating the link if the second application is present. Marshall simply assumes that all applications are in place and discloses the creation of the handles. For example, at Marshall, page 7, lines 1-4, Marshall states:

At the top level, the interface is still simple, but the program has to create a client handle before making a call or create a server handle before receiving

calls. If you want the application to run on all transports, use this interface.

Use of these routines and code samples can be found in Top Level Interface Marshall does not disclose or suggest determining the presence of the second application and generating the link if the second application is present.

Thus, the present invention, according to claim 1, and according to claims 5 and 8, which are similar to claim 1, and according to claims 2, 4, 7, and 9, which depend therefrom, is not unpatentable over Marshall.

The applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, according to claims 3 and 6 is not unpatentable over Marshall in view of APA and further in view of Burns because even if Marshall, APA, and Burns were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the result would not be the present invention as claimed. As described above, Marshall does not disclose or suggest determining the presence of the second data handling application and, if it is present, generating a link to a software routine provided by, and utilizing when executed, the first data handling application, which will be executed by the call routine in the second data handling application. Likewise, APA and Burns do not disclose or suggest this subject matter. Therefore, the combination of Marshall, APA, and Burns still does not disclose or suggest these required features of the present invention.

Thus, the present invention, according to claims 3 and 6 is not unpatentable over Marshall in view of APA.

Each of the claims now pending in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

**Additional Fees:**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0072).

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Schwartz  
Reg. No. 40,161

Dated: January 3, 2006

Swidler Berlin LLP  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20007  
(202) 424-7500